

REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, the Examiner is requested to withdraw the rejections and allow Claims 1-14, as well as newly added Claims 45 to 52, the only claims pending and currently under examination in this application.

The claims have been amended to specify that in step a, the biopolymers are obtained from a plurality of individual identified vessels. Step c has been amended to further clarify that the map of the identity of the vessels is made up of the individual identities of each vessel in the plurality. Newly added claims 45 to 52 are directed to particular representative embodiments of formats of pluralities of vessels, e.g., multiwell trays, as well as representative embodiments of the types of identifiers that may make up the identities of the vessels. Support for all of the above amendments is readily found in the specification at page 10, line 9 to page 11, line 13. As the above amendments enter no new matter to the application, their entry by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

Maintained Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Advisory Action, the rejection of Claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Hunkapiller in view of Zeleny, Brown, Anderson, Shakib and Balaban was maintained.

Following entry of the above amendment, it is believed that the claims clearly specify that a map of the source vessels themselves, and not just the identity of the biopolymers obtained from the source vessels, is associated with the manufactured array in the subject methods.

As such, the identity of the vessels is the specifics of the actual vessel itself, not just the contents thereof.

It is respectfully submitted that the claim language clearly limits the methods to ones that include a step of saving a map of the source vessels **per se** in a

memory, not just the biopolymers that might have been obtained from the source vessels.

Turning now to the rejection, it is respectfully submitted that there is no teaching or suggestion in the combination of rejections to generate a map of the source vessels per se and associate it with the manufactured array. In reading the office action, Zeleny appears to be the reference relied upon to provide the teaching of this element of the claimed methods. However, Zeleny is concerned with recording an identifier on the array which can be used to retrieve the appropriate scanning protocol to use in reading the array. There is no teaching or suggestion in Zeleny, or any of the other references included in the rejection, to specifically record a map of the identify of the source vessels of each biopolymer that is present in each feature of the array.

Because the cited combination of references fails to teach the element of the claimed invention in which a map of the identity of the source vessels per se is associated with the manufactured array, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-14 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hunkapiller in view of Zeleny, Brown, Anderson, Shakib and Balaban and that this rejection may therefore be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that all of the claims are in condition for allowance, which action is requested. If the Examiner finds that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any underpayment of fees associated with this communication, including any necessary fees for extensions of time, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1078.

Respectfully submitted,
BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP

Date: October 25, 2004

By: 

Bret Field
Registration No. 37,620